

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,190	12/31/2003	Toshiyuki Ogata	Q77760	5536	
7590 11/04/2005 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			EXAMINER		
			ZIMMER, MARC S		
Washington, D			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
3 ,				1712	
			DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				<i>\\\\\\\</i>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	T-			
		10/748,190	OGATA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Marc S. Zimmer	1712				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	s			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DON'S IN THE MAILING DO	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commu (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 A	<u>ugust 2005</u> .					
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,5 and 6 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,5 and 6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No. <u>09/922723</u> . ed in this National Sta	ge			
Attachmer	nt(s)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152	2)			

Application/Control Number: 10/748,190

Art Unit: 1712

Based on the Examiner's indication that claim 4 was allowable over *Lin* and claim 7 was allowable over *Tokutake*, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of both original claims 1 and 7. (Claims 4 and 7 were never formally held as being allowable subject matter over *Lin* and *Tokutake* respectively but Applicant recognized that these claims had not been rejected over both references and, therefore, reasonably assumed that the insertion of their collective subject matter into the base claim would render it and claims 5 and 6 allowable.) It is the opinion of the Examiner, original way however, that claim 7 is not patentable over *Tokutake* despite the failure of this reference to disclose a suitable molecular weight. The Examiner sincerely regrets any inconvenience to the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokutake et al., JP 4-130324 in view of Lin et al., U.S. patent # 6,340,734.

Tokutake et al., again, do not provide any indication as to what constitutes a suitable molecular weight range for the organosilicon polymer material. Nevertheless, in the absence of a express teaching of a recommended molecular weight range associated with this component, the skilled artisan will turn to the related art to make a determination as to what molecular weight range has been deemed suitable for

structurally similar polymers used in a similar capacity. Lin et al. disclose a number of silsesquioxane polymer to be employed in the formation of photoresist layers that had anticipated numerous aspects of the originally claimed invention but fail to anticipate the claims as they are presently written for the reason that hydroxylbenzylsilsesquioxane units are not described. On the other hand, Lin discloses a weight-average molecular weight range that almost exactly coincides with that recited by the claim. Given that (i) the polymers disclosed by Lin and Tokutake comprise nearly all the same structural attributes and (ii) the polymers described by each are used for the same purpose, one of ordinary skill would presume that polymers of comparable molecular weight are advantageously employed in the practice of the latter's invention.

As an aside, where polymer formulations are concerned, the molecular weight of the polymer nearly always has important implications for its utility. That is, it is almost universally a result-effective variable. Therefore, the skilled artisan would, if nothing else, optimize this parameter as a matter of routine experimentation with an eye towards the intended application of the polymer compound. "Discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art." *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

This rejection will not be made final because it was possible to reject claim 7 over Tokutake et al. in an earlier stage of prosecition but the Examiner had failed to do so.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc S. Zimmer whose telephone number is 571-272-1096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,190 Page 4

Art Unit: 1712

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 1, 2005

Mare Zemmer AU 1712